



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,794	11/26/2003	Chung-Shuan Li	CU-3465 RJS	7227

26530 7590 09/09/2004

LADAS & PARRY LLP  
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE  
SUITE 1200  
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER

CLARKE, SARA SACHIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3749

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/722,794	LI, CHUNG-SHUAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sara Clarke	3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mashburn et al. (US 4788962) in view of Kojima et al. (US 4874174).

Mashburn et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of the retaining clip including two operating segments, which cross each other.

According to applicant's specification, one of the particular problems with which the inventor was concerned was the difficulty of insertion of the second tube into the first tube. See page 2, lines 12-16. Kojima et al. teaches the use of a retaining clip 130 having two operating segments 137, which cross each other. According to Kojima et al., the configuration taught by Kojima et al. allows for very easy fastening of the tubes. See column 2. Since Kojima et al. teaches solving the same problem as applicant, Kojima et al. is reasonably pertinent to one of the particular problems with which the applicant was concerned. Thus, Kojima et al. is analogous prior art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to provide the cooking assembly of Mashburn et al. with the retaining clip taught by Kojima et al. to provide for very easy fastening of the tubes

without the need for a tool.

Regarding claim 5, Kojima et al. discloses the second coupling member having a tapered end instead of a rounded end. See element 24. It has been held that a change in shape, absent convincing evidence that the particular shape is significant, would have been a matter of choice, which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious. See In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). In the current case, the only evidence that this change in shape might be significant is the claim language itself and applicant's disclosure, which both state that the reason for the particular shape is to facilitate insertion through the clamping segments 52 of the retaining clip 5. However, the tapered shape of Kojima et al. also accomplishes the same function. See column 3, lines 54-63. Since both shapes accomplish the same function in the same manner, applicant's evidence is not found to be convincing. Thus, to have modified the shape of tube end of the combination of Mashburn et al. and Kojima et al. to be rounded instead of tapered would have been a matter of choice, which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 2 and 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hefling et al. (US 5370527), Home (US 4932392), and Koziol


(US 4478205) disclose various barbecues having various connection arrangements.  
Brewer (US 4009896) and Ferguson et al. (US 3314696) disclose various connection arrangements.

**Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara Clarke whose phone number is 703-308-1388. The examiner normally can be reached Mon-Fri, 8:30-1:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached at 703-308-1935. The fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Status information for an application is available from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications is available from Private or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. For questions on access to Private PAIR, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sara Clarke   
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3749

September 7, 2004